

1 J. Paul Gignac (State Bar No. 125676)  
 2 j.paul@aogllp.com  
 3 Kiley L. Grombacher (State Bar No. 245960)  
 4 kgrombacher@aogllp.com  
**5 ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP**  
 6 4050 Calle Real, Suite 130  
 7 Santa Barbara, California 93110-3413  
 8 Telephone: (805) 683-7400  
 9 Facsimile: (805) 683-7401

**E-filing****FILED**

FEE  
NOT PAID  
SI  
2009 JUL 31 P 25

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NO. DIST. OF CA. S.J.

6 Mike Arias (State Bar. No. 115385)  
 7 marias@aogllp.com  
**8 ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP**  
 9 6701 Center Drive West, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 Los Angeles, California 90045  
 Telephone: (805) 683-7400  
 Facsimile: (805) 683-7401

**ADR**

10 Melissa M. Harnett (State Bar No. 164309)  
 11 mharnett@wcclaw.com  
 12 Gregory B. Scarlett (State Bar No. 131486)  
 13 gscarlett@wcclaw.com  
**14 WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, LLP**  
 15 5567 Reseda Boulevard, Suite 330  
 Post Office Box 7033  
 Tarzana, California 91357-7033  
 Telephone: (818) 705-6800 / (323) 872-0995  
 Facsimile: (818) 996-8266

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN JOSE DIVISION**

19 STEVEN PRICE, on behalf of himself and  
 20 all others similarly situated,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 FACEBOOK, INC., a Delaware  
 24 corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,  
 inclusive,

25 Defendants.

C09 Case No. 03519 HRL

CLASS ACTION

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES,  
 RESTITUTION, INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
 AND DECLARATORY RELIEF**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 All allegations in this Complaint are based upon information and belief except those  
2 allegations that pertain to Plaintiff, which are based on personal knowledge. Plaintiff's  
3 information and belief are based upon, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's own investigation and the  
4 investigation conducted by Plaintiff's attorneys. Each allegation in this Complaint either has  
5 evidentiary support or, alternatively, is likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable  
6 opportunity for further investigation and/or discovery.

## **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

8           1. This is an action to enjoin ongoing, unfair and unlawful business practices  
9 and to recover monetary damages and restitution arising out of Facebook's unfair and unlawful  
10 business practices of: (1) charging its "pay per click" advertising customers for "invalid clicks"  
11 that never actually occurred; and (2) giving its advertising customers partial "credits", rather than  
12 full cash refunds, for such invalid clicks.

13                   2. Facebook's practices violate its agreement with its advertising customers as  
14 memorialized in the standardized Facebook Advertising Guidelines and the Statement of Rights  
15 and Responsibilities that Facebook enters into with its advertising customers. Facebook's  
16 wrongful practices predictably involve small amounts of damages, and Facebook is attempting to  
17 carry out a scheme to deliberately cheat large numbers of its advertising customers out of  
18 individually small sums of money.

19                   3. Facebook should be ordered to cease its wrongful practices and should be  
20 required to refund to its present and former advertising customers all monies that Facebook has  
21 collected as a result of its wrongful practices.

## PARTIES

22                  4. Plaintiff Steven Price (“Plaintiff”) is a resident of the State of California,  
23 residing in El Segundo, California.

24           5. Defendant Facebook, Inc. is a Delaware corporation registered to do  
25 business in the State of California, with its principal place of business located in Palo Alto,  
26 California. The Facebook website is a free-access social networking website that is operated and  
27 privately owned by Facebook. The website is accessible to users throughout the United States.

1           6. Plaintiff does not know the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 10,  
2 inclusive, whether individual, corporate, association or otherwise and, therefore, sues said  
3 defendants, and each of them, by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to  
4 include their true names and capacities when they have been ascertained. Each of these Doe  
5 defendants is in some manner legally responsible for the events, happenings, injuries and  
6 damages alleged in this Complaint.

7           7. As used herein, the term "Facebook" refers to Facebook, Inc. and the Doe  
8 defendants.

9           8. In this Complaint, when reference is made to any act, deed or conduct of  
10 Facebook, the allegation means that Facebook engaged in the act, deed or conduct by or through  
11 one or more of its officers, directors, agents, employees or representatives who was actively  
12 engaged in the management, direction, control or transaction of the ordinary business and affairs  
13 of Facebook.

14           **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15           9. Federal jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1331 because Plaintiff  
16 alleges claims for relief under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201 *et seq.*

17           10. Federal jurisdiction is also proper under 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2) because: (a)  
18 Plaintiff is a resident of California, as are many of the proposed class members, whereas  
19 Facebook is incorporated in Delaware; (b) this is a class action that involves more than one  
20 hundred proposed class members; and (c) the amount in controversy in this class action exceeds  
21 \$5,000,000.

22           11. This Court may and should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state  
23 law claims under 28 U.S.C. §1337 because they are derived from a nucleus of operative facts that  
24 is common to the federal law claims such that Plaintiff and Facebook ordinarily would expect to  
25 try both the federal law claims and the state law claims in a single proceeding.

26           12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Facebook because Facebook has  
27 purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting business activities within the State of  
28 California by employing workers within the State of California and by selling its services within

1 the State of California. Facebook generally has maintained systematic and continuous business  
2 contacts within the State of California.

3           13. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2)  
4 because Facebook transacts substantial business within this judicial district thereby subjecting  
5 Facebook to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district. In addition, a substantial part of the  
6 events giving rise to the claims asserted by Plaintiff took place in this judicial district. Finally,  
7 Facebook's Statements of Rights and Responsibilities, which governs Facebook's relationship  
8 with, *inter alia*, its advertising customers, contains a venue provision providing that any claim,  
9 cause of action or dispute arising out of Facebok's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities  
10 should be resolved in a state or federal court located in Santa Clara County.

11           **FACTS RELATING TO FACEBOOK**

12           14. Founded in February 2004, Facebook develops technologies that facilitate  
13 the sharing of information. Facebook is the second most-trafficked PHP site in the world and one  
14 of the largest MySQL installations anywhere, running thousands of databases. Facebook is  
15 accessible internationally.

16           15. To generate revenue, Facebook provides online advertising services. The  
17 Internet research firm eMarketer estimates that Facebook generated about \$210 million in U.S.  
18 advertising revenue in 2008. However, that amount pales in comparison to the estimated \$585  
19 million in advertising revenue that was generated in 2008 by MySpace, Facebook's chief rival.  
20 Recently, there has been speculation in the news media concerning Facebook's ability to survive  
21 as an ongoing business enterprise given its inability to generate revenue.

22           16. Facebook ads appear in the right side column on Facebook pages. In order  
23 to place an ad on Facebook, the advertiser must submit a bid. The Facebook ad system decides  
24 which ads to run by employing an algorithm that estimates the best performing advertisement  
25 based on a number of factors, including historical performance of the ad and its bid. The bid  
26 necessary to win the advertisement fluctuates as the system learns more about the ad's actual  
27 performance and as the pool of competing ads change.

28

1           17. Facebook users can access all of the advertisements that have been shown to  
2 them within a given 24 hour time period through their page or via the "More Ads" link located  
3 under the ads on their page.

4           18. Creation of an advertisement set to run on Facebook is a four-step process:  
5 design, selection of target demographic, scheduling the running of the ad and setting the daily  
6 budget, and finally design review and submission. All ads are designed using software created by  
7 Facebook and accessible to the user via a link from the Facebook website. During the design  
8 process, advertisers may choose to have their ad link either to their external web page or an  
9 internal Facebook link such as a page, application, group or event.

10          19. Advertisers are able to target their exact audience with demographic and  
11 psychographic filters. By default, Facebook targets all users 18 and older in the default location.  
12 Advertisers can schedule their advertisement to run continuously starting once the ad is approved  
13 or at a specified start and end date.

14          20. There is no set cost for Facebook advertisements; rather, Facebook  
15 advertisers can choose to either to pay-per-click or pay for views. Facebook's website touts that  
16 an advertiser can reach more than 200,000,000 active Facebook users.

17          21. Pay-per-click ("PPC") is an internet marketing formula used to price online  
18 advertisements. Also known as cost-per-click ("CPC"), advertisers pay internet publishers based  
19 on the number of individual clicks an advertisement receives. The cost of each click is  
20 determined by a bidding process, wherein the highest bidder for a click would have its ad placed  
21 on the Facebook site.

22          22. An advertiser must confirm the maximum amount he is willing to pay per  
23 click or per 1000 impressions depending on the payment method selected. The suggested bid  
24 range shows the advertiser what other advertisers are currently bidding to reach people in their  
25 target.

26          23. Prior to final submission of their advertisement, advertisers are required to  
27 agree to Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities as well as Facebook's Advertising  
28 Guidelines -- which govern the advertiser's relationship with Facebook.

## **FACTS RELATING TO PLAINTIFF**

24. On or about May 26, 2009, Plaintiff purchased advertising from Facebook. Under the terms of Plaintiff's agreement with Facebook, Facebook was required to provide Internet advertising service to Plaintiff in exchange for payment from Plaintiff. Plaintiff authorized Facebook to direct bill his credit card account for the payments due from him.

25. Plaintiff created his first advertisement on May 26, 2009. He selected the pay-per-click payment method. Plaintiff's advertisement began running on the Facebook website on or about May 27, 2009. Plaintiff's advertisement was designed such that a Facebook user who clicked on Plaintiff's ad would be directed to Plaintiff's website.

26. Plaintiff received the first charge to his credit card from Facebook on or about May 28, 2009. He received numerous additional charges thereafter. Between May 28, 2009 and June 21, 2009, Facebook charged Plaintiff's credit card account more than \$500 for his advertisements. Facebook sent Plaintiff email invoices for each of the charges to his credit card account. However, none of the email invoices details the number of clicks, time of the clicks or origination of the clicks.

27. In an effort to ascertain this information -- which would allow him to tailor his advertisements to maximize profitability -- Plaintiff accessed the Facebook Ad Manager Page. The Facebook Ad Manager Page provides information regarding, *inter alia*, the number of clicks made on an advertisement on a day-by-day basis. Upon reviewing the information related to his ad, Plaintiff became concerned that the number of clicks was overstated. Therefore, Plaintiff used Google Analytics to test the veracity of the data reflected on the Facebook Ad Manager Page.

28. Google Analytics is a software program that generates detailed statistics about visitors to a website. Plaintiff used Google Analytics to test the veracity of the charges that he was receiving from Facebook on eight days between May 27, 2009 and June 3, 2009. Based upon the data Plaintiff received from Google Analytics for these eight days, Plaintiff determined that approximately 66% of the clicks for which he was being charged by Facebook, as reflected on the Facebook Ad Manager Page, were invalid clicks that had never even occurred.

1           29. On or about June 4, 2009, Plaintiff began to run Statcounter.com in  
2 conjunction with the Google Analytics program. Statcounter.com is another web-tracker that  
3 allows the user to analyze and monitor visitors to a website. Plaintiff used both Google Analytics  
4 and Statcounter.com to test the veracity of the charges that he was receiving from Facebook on  
5 five dates on which Plaintiff ran ads between June 4, 2009 and June 21, 2009.

6           30. Based upon the data Plaintiff received from Statcounter.com for the five  
7 dates, Plaintiff determined that approximately 67% of the clicks for which he was being charged  
8 by Facebook, as reflected on the Facebook Ad Manager Page, were invalid clicks that had never  
9 even occurred. Therefore, the data results from Statcounter.com confirmed the findings of  
10 Google Analytics: that is, approximately two-thirds of the clicks for which Plaintiff was being  
11 charged were invalid clicks that had never even occurred.

12          31. Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is an excel spreadsheet that demonstrates the  
13 discrepancies between the clicks for which Plaintiff was charged by Facebook and the clicks that  
14 actually occurred as tracked by Google Analytics and Statcounter.com. For example, for May 27,  
15 2009, the Facebook Ad Manager Page reflects 95 clicks, whereas Google Analytics tracked only  
16 19 clicks – a difference of 76 invalid clicks.

17          32. Facebook has charged, and Plaintiff has paid, for all clicks on Plaintiff's ads.  
18 On June 26, 2009, Facebook notified Plaintiff that "Recently, we have detected an increase in  
19 invalid clicks on Facebook. Your account was impacted and as a result, we are crediting your  
20 account. Your credit has been automatically deposited into your Facebook account and will apply  
21 toward future advertising campaigns. Your credits expire December 15, 2009."

22          33. By voluntarily crediting Plaintiff's account, Facebook admitted that it had  
23 charged Plaintiff for invalid clicks. However, rather than refunding to Plaintiff the monies he had  
24 been charged and paid for these invalid clicks, Facebook gave Plaintiff "credits" in the amount of  
25 \$105.01 that could only be used to purchase additional advertising from Facebook. Moreover,  
26 unlike the cash refund to which Plaintiff is entitled, these credits expire December 15, 2009.  
27 Finally, these credits do not even come close to compensating Plaintiff for the monies that he has  
28 been wrongfully charged and paid to Facebook for invalid clicks.

1                   **SIMILAR COMPLAINTS BY OTHER CUSTOMERS OF FACEBOOK**

2                   34. Other customers of Facebook have complained about being subjected to  
3 the same wrongdoing experienced by Plaintiff. In each case, Facebook improperly charged its  
4 advertising customers for invalid clicks on their advertisements. A sampling of those complaints  
5 is set forth in paragraphs 35 through 40 below.

6                   35. Facebook customer "Jesse" has complained that:

7                   I'm in the middle of some issues with facebook's ad system, which is how  
8 I found your post to begin with. I've been doing research to see if  
9 anyone's run into the same issues I have.

10                  First of all, I should say that not only does my Google Analytics account  
11 show obvious evidence of click fraud, but there's a scarier issue at hand  
12 here. Facebook claims, and has charged me for, 800+ clicks on given days  
13 where my Google Analytics (and a second third-party tracker) reveals only  
14 250-300 clicks via Facebook on those days. This is a huge discrepancy  
15 and amounts to hundreds of dollars on each given day where this occurred.

16                  36. Facebook customer "Russell" has complained that:

17                  I am having similar problems with what I consider to be click fraud.  
18 Google Analytics tells me that I am receiving around 30% less clicks and  
19 those that are coming my way are bouncing at a much higher rate than  
20 other traffic – referred and organic. The conversion rate is also much  
21 lower – around ½ of that of organic traffic, so I think it is pretty clear that  
22 it is not legitimate traffic. I have yet to contact Facebook – I cannot even  
23 find their contact form on their site yet – but will pose Facebook's  
24 response.

25                  37. Facebook customer "Fernando" has complained that:

26                  Same issue here, charged me for 800+ clicks but my 2 site trackers reveals  
27 only 500 visits. I am going to contact them for an explanation otherwise I  
28 will contact my credit card company.

29                  38. Facebook customer "Taavi" has complained that:

30                  I have reached this page for exact same reasons. I noticed that Google  
31 Analytic shows about 30% less visits that Facebook shows(and changes  
32 clicks). I also noticed that I still get visits from Facebook although my ads  
33 have been switched off.

1  
2       39. Facebook customer "Jbenet" has complained that:

3  
4       I have been experimenting with FC ads 3 times now, and for certain  
5       Statcounter shows that I was billed TWICE for every incoming click from  
6       falsebook on my last campaign.

7  
8       Just set up a new site, with google analytics AND statcounter, the site is  
9       getting zero organic traffic, and FB tells me 5 people clicked it, YET I  
10      have had zero visitors still...

11  
12      So either google and statcounter are junk, or... my guess is that Facebook  
13      is running a scam, and maybe Ralph Nader should get his Consumer  
14      Reports to look into it.

15  
16      40. Facebook customer "Marc" has complained that:

17  
18      We started using Facebook Ads about a week ago. Our site only has  
19      around 30 unique visitors per day and around 100 returning visitors a day.  
20      We use Google Analytics to watch this traffic and monitor what States our  
21      advertising is doing better in. We setup a campaign in two cities, Boston  
22      and Las Vegas. Facebook charged us for 27 clicks in Las Vegas and 36 in  
23      Boston over the first few days. Google Analytics tells me that we only  
24      received a total of 4 new visitors in Las Vegas and only 3 in Boston over  
25      the last week. None of which came from Facebook and none of the days  
26      Facebook claimed the took place on. We have two Facebook pages that  
27      sent traffic of 32 unique visits "Before" we used the Ads system and those  
28      visits took place over a week before we started the Ads campaign. We  
      have no proof that Facebooks Adds were legitimate clicks, we can only  
      prove that Facebook has charged us \$1.00 for each click.

19  
20      We have a feeling all of these clicks are fraudulent and false. We are also  
21      having trouble contacting Facebook to get the issue resolved and have  
22      discontinued our Ads in the time being.

23  
**CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

24  
25      41. Plaintiff brings this class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of  
26      Civil Procedure on behalf of a class of advertising customers of Facebook as defined herein.  
27      Plaintiff is a member of the class that he seeks to represent.

28      42. Pursuant to Facebook's Statements of Rights and Responsibilities, which  
      governs Facebook's relationship with advertising customers and others who interact with

1 Facebook, California law applies to the claims of all advertising customers of Facebook. As a  
2 result, Plaintiff shall seek to represent a nationwide class ("the Class") as to all claims for relief  
3 alleged herein. Plaintiff proposes to define the Class as follows:

4 All pay-per-click advertising customers of Facebook who reside in  
5 the United States and who were charged for "invalid clicks".

6 43. The members of the Class shall be referred to herein  
7 collectively as the "Class Members".

8 44. The following pay-per-click advertising customers of Facebook shall be  
9 excluded from the Class and therefore shall not qualify as Class Members: (a) all employees,  
10 officers, directors, agents and legal representatives of Facebook; (b) any judge, justice or judicial  
11 officer assigned to hear any proceeding in relation to this case; and (c) all persons who validly  
12 exclude themselves from the Class.

14 45. While the exact number of Class Members is unknown to Plaintiff at this  
15 time and can only be determined by appropriate discovery, membership in the Class is ascertaina-  
16 ble based upon the billing records maintained by Facebook. The Class consists of many  
17 hundreds, if not many thousands, of members, the identities of which are within the knowledge of  
18 and can be ascertained by Facebook by reference to its customer records. Therefore, the Class  
19 Members are sufficiently numerous that joining all Class Members in a single action is  
20 impracticable under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1), and the resolution of their claims through the  
21 procedure of a class action will be of benefit to the parties and the Court.

22 46. Common questions of law and fact exist as to the Class Members, as  
23 required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2), and predominate over any questions that affect only  
24 individual Class Members within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3).

25 47. The questions of fact that are common to the Class Members include, but  
26 are not limited to, the following:  
27  
28

- 1           a. whether Facebook improperly assesses charges to the Class  
2           Members for invalid clicks;
- 3           b. whether Facebook generated or caused to be generated the invalid  
4           clicks;
- 5           c. whether Facebook provides partial “credits”, rather than full cash  
6           refunds, to the Class Members for invalid clicks; and
- 7           d. whether the Class Members were damaged as a result of  
8           Facebook’s actions and conduct.

9           48. The questions of law that are common to the Class Members include, but  
10          are not limited to, the following:

- 11           a. whether Facebook breached the terms and/or implied covenants of  
12           its contracts with the Class Members;
- 13           b. whether the Class Members are entitled to declaratory relief under  
14           the Declaratory Judgment Act;
- 15           c. whether Facebook has committed one or more acts of “unfair  
16           competition” within the meaning of and in violation of California  
17           Business and Professions Code §17200, *et seq.*; and
- 18           d. whether Facebook, by its actions and conduct, has been unjustly  
19           enriched at the expense and to the detriment of the Class Members.

20           49. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class Members whom he  
21          seeks to represent under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3) because Plaintiff and each of the Class Members  
22          have been subjected to the same improper practices and have been damaged in the same manner.

23           50. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the  
24          Class Members as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). Plaintiff is an adequate representative of  
25          the Class, as he has no interests that are adverse to the Class Members. Plaintiff is committed to  
26          the vigorous prosecution of this action on behalf of the Class Members and, to that end, Plaintiff  
27          has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in handling class action litigation.

1           51. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and  
2 efficient adjudication of the claims asserted in this action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) because:

- 3                 a. the Class Members have no interest in individually controlling the  
4 prosecution of separate actions on their own behalves because the  
5 expense and burden of individual litigation make it economically  
6 unfeasible for the Class Members to seek redress other than through  
7 the procedure of a class action;
- 8                 b. the Class Members have not commenced and are not pursuing other  
9 litigation against Facebook arising out of the subject matter of this  
10 class action lawsuit, and if separate actions were brought by  
11 individual Class Members, the resulting duplicity of lawsuits would  
12 cause undue hardship and expense to the Court and the litigants by  
13 necessitating multiple trials of similar factual issues;
- 14                 c. it is desirable to concentrate the litigation of the Class Members'  
15 claims in this forum because all of the Class Members are residents  
16 of the State of California and because the Class Members allege  
17 claims under federal law and California state law; and
- 18                 d. Plaintiff is aware of no difficulty likely to be encountered in the  
19 management of this litigation that should preclude its maintenance  
20 as a class action.

21           52. In the alternative, this action is certifiable under the provisions of Fed. R.  
22 Civ. P. 23(b)(1) and/or (b)(2) because:

- 23                 a. the prosecution of separate actions by individual Class Members  
24 would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with  
25 respect to individual Class Members which would establish incom-  
26 patible standards of conduct for Facebook;
- 27                 b. the prosecution of separate actions by individual Class Members  
28 would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them which

1                   would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the  
2                   other Class Members not parties to the adjudications, or  
3                   substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;  
4                   and

5                   c.     Facebook has acted or refused to act on grounds generally  
6                   applicable to the Class Members, thereby making appropriate final  
7                   injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to  
8                   the Class Members as a whole and necessitating that any such relief  
9                   be extended to the Class Members on a mandatory, class-wide  
10                  basis.

11                 53.    The names and addresses of the Class Members are available from  
12                 Facebook's records. Notice can be provided to the Class Members via first class mail or  
13                 otherwise using techniques and a form of notice similar to those customarily used in class actions  
14                 arising under California state law and federal law. Specifically, notice can be provided to the  
15                 Class Members by posting a notice on the Facebook main page. Additionally notice can be  
16                 provided to the Class Members who are current advertising customers of Facebook by including a  
17                 notice in or on the monthly bill sent to Facebook's advertising customers with the minimal cost  
18                 of such notice to be borne by Facebook.

19                 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
20                 (Breach of Contract)

21                 54.    Plaintiff repeats and incorporates herein by reference the allegations  
22                 contained in paragraphs 1 through 53 of this Complaint.

23                 55.    Plaintiff brings this claim for relief on behalf of himself and the members  
24                 of the Class.

25                 56.    The relationship between Facebook and its advertising customers is  
26                 governed by Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities. A true and correct copy of  
27                 Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities is attached hereto as Exhibit "B".

1           57. Under the terms of Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities,  
2 Facebook agreed, *inter alia*, whether expressly or implicitly, to provide advertising services to  
3 Plaintiff and the Class Members, and Plaintiff and the Class Members correspondingly agreed to  
4 pay for such services on a PPC basis.

5               58. Plaintiff and the Class Members have performed all conditions, covenants,  
6 and promises required to be performed on their part in accordance with the terms of their  
7 contracts with Facebook, except to the extent such performance was excused, released or waived  
8 by the actions, conduct or agreement of Facebook.

9               59. Pursuant to the terms of Facebook's standardized contracts, Plaintiff and  
10 the Class Members were to be charged PPC fees based on the number of clicks by a user on the  
11 advertisements of Plaintiff and other Class Members.

12                 60. Facebook breached the terms of its contracts by charging fees to Plaintiff  
13 and the Class Members for invalid clicks that never even occurred.

14                   61. Alternatively, by charging fees to Plaintiff and the Class Members for  
15 invalid clicks that never even occurred., Facebook breached the implied covenant of good faith  
16 and fair dealing in its contracts with Plaintiff and the Class Members.

17                 62. As a direct and proximate result of Facebook's breach of contract, Plaintiff  
18 and the Class Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial.

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
(Declaratory Judgment Under 28 U.S.C. § 2201)

20                         63. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates herein by reference the allegations  
21 contained in paragraphs 1 through 53 of this Complaint.

22                  64. Plaintiff brings this claim for relief on behalf of himself and the members  
23 of the Class.

24  
25 65. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiff and the  
26 Class Members, on one hand, and Facebook, on the other hand, concerning their respective rights  
27 and duties. Plaintiff and the Class Members contend that Facebook's practices of charging its advertising  
customers for invalid clicks that never even occurred and giving its advertising

customers partial “credits”, rather than full cash refunds, for such invalid clicks are improper and unlawful, while Facebook maintains that its actions and conduct are lawful and proper.

66. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time, under the circumstances presented, in order that Plaintiff and the Class Members may ascertain their rights and duties with respect to Facebook's practices of charging its advertising customers for invalid clicks that never even occurred and giving its advertising customers partial "credits", rather than full cash refunds, for such invalid clicks.

**THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
**(Unjust Enrichment)**

67. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 53 of this Complaint.

68. Plaintiff brings this claim for relief on behalf of himself and the members of the Class.

69. Facebook has engaged in the unfair, inequitable and/or unconscionable practices of: (1) charging and collecting fees for invalid clicks that never even occurred; and (2) giving its advertising customers partial “credits”, rather than full cash refunds, for such invalid clicks.

70. As a direct and proximate result of Facebook's unfair, inequitable and/or unconscionable practices, Facebook has been unjustly enriched at the expense of and to the detriment of Plaintiff and the Class Members.

71. By reason of Facebook's conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to restitution of all monies paid to Facebook for invalid clicks that never even occurred.

**FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
(Violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*)

72. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 62 and 68 through 71 of this Complaint.

73. Plaintiff brings this claim for relief on behalf of himself and the members of the Class.

74. Facebook has engaged in and continues to engage in the unfair and/or unlawful business practices of: (1) charging and collecting fees for invalid clicks that never even occurred; and (2) giving its advertising customers partial “credits”, rather than full cash refunds, for such invalid clicks.

75. By engaging in these practices, Facebook has committed one or more acts of unfair competition within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

76. Facebook's practices are unfair because they are immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous and/or substantially injurious to Plaintiff and the Class Members.

77. Facebook's practices are unlawful because they constitute breach of contract and unjust enrichment.

78. Unless Facebook is enjoined from continuing to engage in these unfair and/or unlawful business practices, Plaintiff and the Class Members will continue to be injured by Facebook's wrongful actions and conduct.

79. So as not to be unjustly enriched by its own wrongful actions and conduct, Facebook should be required to disgorge and restore to Plaintiff and the Class Members all monies wrongfully obtained by Facebook as a result of its unfair and/or unlawful business practices, together with interest thereon.

## **RELIEF REQUESTED**

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class Members, requests that this Court order the following relief and enter judgment against Facebook as follows:

### On The First Claim For Relief

For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof at trial; and

For prejudgment interest through the date of entry of judgment.

## On The Second Claim For Relief

That this Court declare that Facebook's practices of charging and collecting fees for invalid clicks that never even occurred and giving its advertising customers partial "credits", rather than full cash refunds, for such invalid clicks are improper and unlawful.

### On The Third Claim For Relief

For disgorgement and restitution to Plaintiff and the Class Members of all monies wrongfully obtained and retained by Facebook; and

For prejudgment interest through the date of entry of judgment.

#### On The Fourth Claim For Relief

For disgorgement and restitution to Plaintiff and the Class Members of all monies wrongfully obtained and retained by Facebook;

For an order enjoining Facebook from: (1) charging and collecting fees for invalid clicks that never even occurred; and (2) giving its advertising customers partial “credits”, rather than full cash refunds, for such invalid clicks; and

For prejudgment interest through the date of entry of judgment.

**On All Claims For Relief**

For all attorneys' fees, expenses and recoverable costs reasonably incurred in connection with the commencement and prosecution of this action, provided that this action results in a common fund for the benefit of the Class Members and/or confers a substantial benefit on the Class Members; and

For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable in this action.

Dated: July 30, 2009

ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP

By: J. Paul Gignac (State Bar No. 125676)  
j.paul@aogllp.com  
Kiley L. Grombacher (State Bar No. 245960)  
kgrombacher@aogllp.com  
ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP  
4050 Calle Real, Suite 130  
Santa Barbara, California 93110-3413  
Telephone: (805) 683-7400  
Facsimile: (805) 683-7401

Mike Arias (State Bar. No. 115385)  
marias@aogllp.com  
ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLE  
6701 Center Drive West, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
Telephone: (805) 683-7400  
Facsimile: (805) 683-7401

Melissa M. Harnett (State Bar No. 164309)  
mharnett@wcclaw.com  
Gregory B. Scarlett (State Bar No. 131486)  
gscarlett@wcclaw.com  
WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, LLP  
5567 Reseda Boulevard, Suite 330  
Post Office Box 7033  
Tarzana, California 91357-7033  
Telephone: (818) 705-6800 / (323) 872-0995  
Facsimile: (818) 996-8266

Attorneys for Plaintiff